DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 086 HE 026 694

AUTHOR Townsend, Barbara K.
TITLE Community College Transfer Students in an Urban University: Survival of the Fittest?
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Case Studies; *College Students; *Community Colleges; Educational Environment; Higher Education; Interviews; *Private Colleges; Student Attitudes; Student Attrition; *Student Characteristics; *Transfer Students; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

A case study was done to understand the possible obstacles to the transfer and retention of community college students who have moved to the university. The study focused on the perceptions of a group of community college transfer students about the transfer process and their new academic world. The students all transferred from a large, public, urban community college with open admissions to a private, religiously-affiliated, moderately selective, doctorate-granting university in the same urban area. Forty-four participants were interviewed concerning their experiences and to uncover dynamics in the process and classroom. Of the participants, 7 had graduated from the university, 16 were no longer attending, and 21 were still enrolled. The data suggested that the community college transfer student who succeeds at this university is a fairly self-reliant student able to survive with minimal institutional help. The transfer students were surprised at the competitiveness among the university students and the Darwinian attitude of the faculty toward their students. Overall, community college transfer students were adapted to the community college student-centered approach designed to raise self-esteem sometimes at the expense of academic standards. Such students may be confused and shocked when they face different standards and expectations. Contains 21 references and the interview questions. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Community College Transfer Students in an Urban University: Survival of the Fittest?

Barbara K. Townsend
Loyola University Chicago

ED 362 086

HE026 694

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara K. Townsend

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Community College Transfer Students in an Urban University: Survival of the Fittest?

Barbara K. Townsend
Loyola University Chicago

The transfer process between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities is currently under heavy scrutiny. Two-year schools serve as the entry point into higher education for many minority students, and senior institutions anxious to increase their minority enrollments look to community colleges as sources of transfer students. Usually the focus is upon what community colleges can do to improve the process or mechanics of transferring (e.g., Kintzer and Wattenbarger 1985; Pincus and Archer 1989). Less frequently is attention paid to what four-year colleges and universities can also do to facilitate transfer (e.g., Donovan, Schaier-Peleg, and Forer 1987). Rarely is the question raised, "What should four-year college and university faculty and administrators do to facilitate the success of community college students once they are at the senior institution?"

Normed to the mores and educational expectations of the community college, community college transfer students often suffer "transfer shock" (Hill 1965; Williams 1973) at senior institutions. Usually manifested by a dip in grade point average, this shock may be so severe that individual students drop out, perhaps to go to another school whose environment is more compatible with their academic abilities and psychological needs or perhaps to a future where completion of a four-year degree is no longer a goal.

Influenced by Tinto's (1975, 1987) theory of why students may withdraw from a particular institution, student retention studies frequently concentrate upon how students integrate themselves into a school's social and academic systems. However, since many community college transfers are commuter students, they may have fewer opportunities or be less willing to integrate themselves into a college or university's social system. If administrators and faculty at senior-level institutions wish not only to attract but also to retain community college transfer students, they must pay attention to the academic system and provide a teaching-learning environment conducive to community college transfer students' success (Setting the National Agenda 1991). Although there have been several in-depth studies of the teaching-learning environment in individual community colleges (Kempner 1990; London 1978; Richardson, Fisk, and Okun 1983; Weis 1985), few, if any, studies have examined the academic environment at the four-year college or university level from the perspective of the community college transfer student.

Focus of the Study

To aid in understanding possible obstacles to the transfer and retention of community college students who have moved to the university, I conducted a case study that focused upon perceptions of a group of community college transfer students about two significant situations: the transfer process itself and the

academic world or environment to which they had transferred. A fundamental premise of this study is that understanding how community college transfer students view the transfer process and their academic experiences at the community college and the university is crucial to improving the enrollment and retention of community college transfer students in the four-year sector.

The objectives of this descriptive, exploratory study were twofold. The first was to learn how students viewed the transfer process, including if and how both the community college and the university facilitated the process, and what each institution could have done to have made the process easier. The second objective was to learn how students perceived certain aspects of each institution's academic environment, defined in this study as a composite of 1) academic standards; 2) classroom atmosphere, including interactions between students and teachers and among students; 3) tests and assignments; 4) attendance policies; 5) faculty attitudes and behaviors; and 6) student attitudes and behaviors.

Regarding the transfer process, my assumptions or "guiding hypotheses" (Marshall and Rossman 1991) were as follows: 1) Students would perceive community college representatives as aiding them in the transfer process, 2) Students would view community college representatives as more helpful than university representatives, and 3) Students would report difficulties in the transfer process, perhaps sufficient to make them question their decision to transfer. Regarding the academic environment of the two institutions, my assumptions were 1) students would perceive the university's academic standards to be higher than those of the community college, 2) students would consider their community college academic experience to be helpful but sometimes insufficient preparation for university-level academics, and 3) students would perceive community college faculty as more caring and helpful but less rigorous than university faculty members.

The population for this study was all students who had transferred from a particular urban community college to attend full-time a nearby urban university during the academic years Fall 1987-Spring 1992. Additionally, the students might have attended other community colleges prior to attending the community college in the study, but none had attended a four-year college or university. Rather than the population being all community college students who had transferred to the university, I limited the population to students from one particular community college so that all students in the study could make the same institution-specific comparisons.

The community college in the study is a large, public, urban community college with open admissions. In Fall 1992 it enrolled over 5,000 students in credit courses and over 10,000 students in non-credit courses. This particular community college was chosen because of the racial and ethnic diversity of its student body, which includes a large number of international students[1]. Of the students taking credit courses in Fall 1992, 24% were Asian, 22% Black, 13% Hispanic, 1% Native American, 39% White, and 1% other.

Given the diversity of the school's student body, I assumed that as a group, transfer students from this institution would be more racially and ethnically diverse than transfer students from the area's suburban community colleges. I wanted as racially and ethnically diverse a group of community college transfer students as possible so as to provide perspectives not bounded or dominated by one racial or ethnic group.

The university is a private, religiously-affiliated, moderately selective, doctorate-granting I university located in the same metropolitan area as the community college. Relative to the public four-year colleges in the area, the university is expensive, charging approximately $9,000 a year for undergraduate tuition. Its Fall 1992 enrollment was over 5,700 full-time and 3,800 part-time undergraduate students[2] and almost 6,000 full and part-time graduate and professional students. Transfer students average 8% of the university's undergraduate student body. In Fall 1992 53% of the 493 undergraduate transfer students came from community colleges, including 9% from the community colleges within the city in which the university is located.

This particular university was chosen for the study for two reasons. First of all, it is officially committed to diversifying its student body and thus is supportive of efforts to enroll community college transfers. Also, while university faculty are stereotypically portrayed, especially in the community college literature, as absorbed in their subject matter and not particularly interested in their undergraduate students (Seidman 1985), many members of the university in this study pride themselves on the institution's teaching and student-centered approach, both of which are stressed in its recruitment literature. Given the university's espoused commitment to teaching and student-centered approach, I assumed its academic environment might be more compatible with that of the community college than would a large public university's.

There were 44 students who had the characteristics sought in this study. Seven (16%) had graduated from the university when data collection began, 16 (36%) were no longer attending the university, and 21 (48%) were still enrolled (See Table 1 for demographics of each of these four groups).

Methods

Interviews were used to gain a sense of how these students understand their transfer and academic experiences and to uncover dynamics in the transfer process and in their classroom experiences that cannot be elicited through responses on a survey instrument.

The 21 students who were enrolled at the university in Spring 1992 were contacted, first by letter and then by phone, for their willingness to be interviewed about the transfer process and their academic experiences at both schools. During the summer and fall of 1992, ten students agreed to be interviewed on campus, either singly or in groups of two for a period lasting from one to two hours. One declined to be interviewed after coming to the

interview session and learning more about the study. The interviews were conducted by a female graduate student close in age to the students.

With the nine students who consented to be part of the study, in-depth focused interviews were used to elicit answers to questions about how the students viewed the transfer process and about how the academic environment of the two schools compared (See Appendix for interview questions). The interviews were taped and then selectively transcribed. I coded responses to each question by themes and categories developed after several readings of the interview data (Strauss and Corbin 1990). In an effort to strengthen the reliability of the analysis, responses to three of the questions were also coded by a colleague with the codes discussed with and compared to those of the researcher.

To supplement the data in the study, I also contacted the 16 community college transfer students who were no longer attending the university. To aid in preventing method bias, I did not attempt interviews but rather sent these individuals a researcher-designed, one-page survey incorporating both close-ended and open-ended questions. Respondents were asked to do the following: (1) evaluate the teaching at both the community college and the university, (2) compare the teaching-learning process at both institutions, (3) assess how well the community college prepared them academically for the university, (4) state their reason(s) for leaving the university, and (5) state what the university could have done to have helped them stay at it. After two mailings of the survey, five students had responded to the survey (31% response rate). However, five of the surveys were undeliverable because of address changes. Thus the adjusted response rate was 45%.

Findings

The findings will be presented in two parts: (1) the perceptions of community college transfer students who were still enrolled at the university, and (2) the survey responses of students who had withdrawn from the university

Perceptions of the transfer process: Among students still enrolled in the university, students perceived that they did not seek or receive help from the community college in the transfer process. Almost all the students chose to rely upon themselves or occasionally on their friends or relatives. The following comments were typical:

> I knew about the Transfer Center but I decided not to use it. I didn't consult anyone at [the community college]. I did it myself.
>
> The only office I contacted was admissions at [the community college] because I needed my transcript sent to [the university].
>
> I didn't receive any assistance from [the community college]

but rather from a friend at [the university].

> My brothers and sisters also transferred from [the community college] to [the university], and since I had their help, I didn't seek help from anyone at [the community college]. I never went to any counselors. I never really talked to anybody.

One student was forced to rely on herself since the community college failed to meet her request for help:

> I tried to get help from [the community college], but no one could help me . . . everyone I asked, they told me they didn't know. So I said, 'Forget it, I'll just come to [the university]. I found out after I left [the community college] I was supposed to see a guidance counselor there. I didn't know that. It was too late . . . So I just came over here and they gave me the name of my dean and I made an appointment.

Only one student used the community college's center established to aid potential transfer students.[3] This student made it clear she could not have attended the university without the Transfer Center's help since it was there she learned about the state financial aid that was available.

At the same time that most students claimed they had transferred "on my own," three of the nine students indicated they had received help from a university admissions representative who visited the community college campus and provided applications, information about transferability of courses, and financial aid information. In other words, the students perceived they did it by themselves, but actually the community college assisted in the process by inviting university representatives to recruit on campus. Similarly the university assisted by sending representatives to the community college for recruitment purposes.

In general, university staff were praised for assisting students who came on their own initiative to the university to find out what needed to be done to transfer. Only one student complained that "as a transfer student, they wouldn't help me." She added that part of the problem was that "everyone was on vacation at that time" because she decided to start in a summer session.

None of the students participated in the university's sole official effort to socialize transfer students to the university, an orientation for transfer students from both two-year and four-year schools. In some instances the students' self-reliance was again apparent in their reasons for not attending the orientation:

> I was aware of the orientation but decided not to go. I was only interested in knowing which building housed the nursing program. However, my first day I was lost and it might have been a good idea if I'd gone to the orientation.

> I'm from [the city] so I pretty much know where everything is.
>
> There was one offered but I didn't go. I work a lot. I just found my way around.
>
> I knew there was one but I decided not to go. I think I had to work that day.

Sometimes the students were forced to be self-reliant because of institutional failure to communicate with them. Three of the students received no information or incomplete orientation information, so they could not have attended the orientation even if they had wanted to do so.

Although most students declared they had "done it on my own" and sometimes complained about both institutions' poor communications with students during the process, almost uniformly they assessed the transfer process as "easy." Typical comments included the following:

> I was very satisfied with the whole procedure and the advisor [at the university].
>
> It was too easy. It was great.
>
> Everything ran smoothly.
>
> No criticisms. No suggestions. I thought it was just perfect.

Thus my findings in the study did not support my guiding hypotheses about the transfer process. Students did not perceive they had received transfer help from the community college. They also did not perceive university representatives to be less helpful but rather more helpful than community college representatives in facilitating the transfer process. Students also did not perceive the transfer process to be difficult; instead they saw it as "easy."

Perceptions of each institution's academic environment: Most students perceived the university's academic standards as higher or "more difficult" than those of the community college. Only two of the students thought the standards were "almost the same thing." Typical comments of students who thought the university's standards were higher were:

> There's definitely a higher standard at [the university] than for [the community college]. The [university] courses are definitely harder. The introductory courses are less introductory . . . not as basic . . . courses are academically more demanding.
>
> [At the university] you really have to study to get very good grades . . . At [the community college] I just didn't

> feel challenged. I really didn't study as much and I was on the dean's list. And like here, I would study and still I'm not on the dean's list.
>
> . . . the (university) grading was more what I expected (in college) than at [the community college] where they were amazed if you knew how to use a semicolon.

Also as I had expected, when asked how well [the community college] had prepared them for [the university], most of the students either said it had not prepared them sufficiently, or said it had, except in some areas. The harshest comment was from the student who said, "Honestly, I think high school prepared me more for what [the university] was going to be than [the community college] did." Three students felt unprepared in math, one in writing and public speaking, one in general knowledge defined as "not knowing a lot of the readings others [in the university classes] did," and one in the sciences. Suggestions for improving the preparation included the following:

> [The community college] students should be aware of the academic rigors of [the university] before they enroll. Someone should state clearly to them what will be expected of them academically.
>
> [The community college] could provide a more rigid classroom atmosphere. I just felt like at [the community college] you didn't have to be so formal, which is nice.

Assignments and Tests: As is typical of community college students nationally (e.g., Doughterty 1987; Kissler, Lara, and Cardinal 1981), these students had had a limited experience with writing assignments or essay tests at the community college. Eight of the nine students indicated that university faculty required more writing, both for assignments and for tests, that did community college faculty. As one student said, "I have found the key to doing well at [the university] is being able to write."

One international student much preferred the community college's approach to writing, whereby students could take assignments home rather than having to deal with the pressure of writing something in class. A native-born student believed her writing was "not up to par" and "my skills were not as sharp as they could be" because the community college spent so much time on students for whom English was not their native language. She had been an A student in her English class at the community college and had also been "the only American in a class of foreign (sic) students."

Most students perceived that university faculty gave few multiple-choice tests. According to one student, even when they did, the tests were very different from the ones at the community college where "I was used to the type of multiple choice test where there was only one right answer and the other ones were off the

wall."

Faculty accessibility and willingness to help students: An unexpected finding was that most of the students perceived the university faculty as available for questions and meeting outside of class. Two students thought they were more available than the community college faculty. However, one of the two students who viewed the university faculty as more distant than the community college faculty said, "At [the university] you don't have much of a relationship with professors unless you really go out of your way. At least I haven't had a chance to." She later stated, however, that she had never tried to make an appointment with a teacher at the university and thus couldn't really say if they were available to students.

There were mixed perceptions about [the university] faculty's willingness to help students. While [university] faculty in general were considered helpful, four of the students related very negative classroom incidents, as follows:

> My first computer class [at the university] . . . he was the worst professor I had ever had. This man should not be teaching. I went to him for help and he told me it was self-explanatory and that if I couldn't understand it I should get out of his class. I was so furious! I never thought a professor could say that to me. I told him that he shouldn't be teaching.
>
> My girlfriend had a physics teacher who wouldn't answer any algebra-related questions in class. His response was, 'Go learn your algebra and then come back here.'
>
> I had one teacher who was teaching a very difficult subject and he would just read it straight to us out of the book, and it was way over our heads. And then he would translate it into just as difficult terms . . . Several students approached him about what he was doing, but he didn't change.
>
> I never had Shakespeare in high school and so I thought, 'Oh, I want to try this . . . . So I took this class and it was a big mistake. It seemed like he expected us to understand the book and that was why we were in the class. And for me, I am a student, I want to learn, that is why I am there . . . . I went up to [the teacher] and told him I really didn't understand a thing, and the teacher just said, 'Oh, there is a counseling center."

It is not difficult to hear the "shock" in students' voices as they encountered university faculty who were unsympathetic to students' lack of academic background upon entry to a course.

As I had anticipated, community college faculty were sometimes considered more helpful than the university faculty, partly because of how the community college faculty taught. One of the

international students indicated how the community college faculty, unlike the university faculty, gave mostly take-home assignments. She thought the university was going to have to deal with having more international students such as herself, who found it "hard to improve because you don't have time to work things through" when you can only do them during class. Another student preferred the community college faculty's approach of doing in-class work, where 'we'd work things out together. At [the university] it's lecture and you take things home and do it yourself . . . They throw all this information at you. Then you have ten pages of notes and you sit at home by yourself." Similarly, another student commented, "There are some teachers (at the university) that make the students understand, 'I'm not willing to answer questions--I'm giving you a lecture--take down notes--study on your own.'"

Classroom atmosphere: Classroom atmosphere was perceived by most students in terms of students' willingness to help one another and comfortableness in asking questions in class. An unexpected finding was several students' perception that the competitive nature of the university made students reluctant to help one another academically:

> There is more competition than I expected. At [the community college] you go to learn, there is no competition. Here I really feel bad for the students because there is so big (sic) pressure. I wish there was a way where they could help each other. . . . At [the community college] you can learn from everyone's experiences. Students are more encouraged to share in class. . . . At [the university] students aren't interested in helping one another.
>
> [University] students are more competitive. In some ways that's good because it makes you work harder, but it's bad because I don't want to get mixed up in that kind of atmosphere where I always have to watch out for myself, you know, watch my back because if I don't keep up to date someone is going to step over me.
>
> There's peer pressure to be on time at [the university]. It's not a teacher expectation. It's just that you don't want to miss any information because you're afraid to ask others for the notes.

Similarly, fear that other students, rather than the faculty, would find their questions "dumb" or inappropriate seemed to work against students asking questions in the classroom. Students were seemingly more concerned about losing face with one another than with the instructor.

Student Perceptions of Why the Two Schools Differ: An intriguing finding of the study was how the students made sense of the two institutions' differing academic environments. Although not asked why they thought the two institutions differed, several students suggested that community college students collectively

were the reason behind any difficulties they, as individuals, might have in the university. Typical comments included the following:

> The caliber of students in [the community college] classes probably had a lot to do with the caliber of teaching. You had to teach to their level. . . Having lots of foreign (sic) students who couldn't speak English well prevented the teachers from going at a faster pace.
>
> Many of my teachers at [the community college] never got all the way through the syllabus by the end of the term. They went so slowly. I don't know whether it was the teacher or the student.
>
> It's the students that make a difference because over there I was always considered a very good student, and I guess that's because everyone else wasn't that good of a student . . . So I think the junior college needs to get more students who are more competitive or who have better grades. I don't think they have a good mixture of students over there. They are mostly not that well educated (before coming to the community college) . . . I heard from my sister-in-law who goes to school there now that they are letting in people off the street.
>
> [University] students tend to be a lot more serious than [the community college] students . . . more goal-oriented . . . a lot more responsible . . . they also tend to be more intelligent for lack of a better word . . . more prepared for a college situation.

In other words, students who articulated a reason for the differing academic standards usually said they stemmed from a difference in the student bodies, with the university having better students than the community college. The great diversity of the community college's student body, and particularly its large number of international students, was perceived by several of the native-born students as a barrier to the quality of education provided by the university, whose student body was perceived almost uniformly as "so white!"

Responses of students who had left the university without graduating: Five of the sixteen students who left the university without graduating responded to a one-page survey about their experiences at the university and the community college. Their responses provide another perspective on how community college transfers see the two institutions and what concerns these students may have about their post community college/university education.

A common assumption about students who leave an institution without graduating is that they do so because of academic difficulties. This may have been a reason why some of the 16 students left the university. Of the non-respondents, nine had a university GPA of less than 2.0, which is equivalent to a C

average. Of these nine, four were dropped for poor scholarship. However, of the five respondents to the survey, four had a passing GPA, with the average GPA being 2.45. Only one respondent left with a failing GPA: 0.0 after one semester at the university. While average GPA was a major difference between respondents and non-respondents as groups, otherwise their characteristics were similar.

None of the respondents indicated that differences in academic standards or in the teaching-learning process caused them to leave the university. Instead, two cited financial reasons and three cited curricular, i.e., a desire for majors the university did not offer. These three respondents had transferred to a school that offered the desired major. When asked what the university could have done to have helped them stay, the two who left for financial reasons indicated a need for help on this issue. One of them suggested "payment plans for tuition."

When asked if they believed the community college had prepared them adequately for the university, three said yes, one said no, and one wrote that [the community college] "needs to focus more on written skills and to come up with and express critical thought." When asked which institution's teaching-learning process was more effective for them, four of the five students named the university. Reasons given included the greater "enthusiasm" of [the university] faculty, the "fast pace at which the (university) classes moved [that] required more of you to keep up," and the emphasis on critical thinking. Additionally, one respondent preferred the university because "the quality of students is much better which creates a competitive yet educational atmosphere."

Discussion and Implications for Practice

Given the small sample size and the institution-specific nature of the study, the findings of this study can only be suggestive, for the two institutions themselves and by extension for community colleges and universities interested in understanding the dynamics of the transfer process and factors affecting the retention of community college transfer students.

What the data do suggest is that the community college transfer student who succeeds at this university is a fairly self-reliant student, able to survive with minimal institutional help. These students' self-reliance was initially manifested during the transfer process and upon initial entry to the university. For example, most of the students relied upon the community college only for mechanical or bureaucratic help such as sending of transcripts to the university. Students were far more likely to use the personal resources of friends and family rather than institutional ones of community college transfer centers and university orientation programs. It may be that the help and encouragement of peers who have made it to the four-year sector are perceived as more accurate and reliable than institutional help.

What this finding suggests for university members is that the more community college transfers they enroll, the more they are

likely to enroll. Friends and relatives of the recruited and enrolled students will then become likely applicants since they will already have a peer to rely upon for survival of the initial transfer process as well as the university academic experience.

The university may also be more likely to enroll transfer students if its representatives go to the community colleges rather than relying completely upon the community college to assist students in the transfer process. While at the community college, university representatives can recruit students and facilitate their entrance into the university by providing them with information about applications, transferability of credits, and available financial aid. Similarly, the community college transfer center has an important role to play through facilitating the meeting of community college students with university representatives.

Once transfer students are enrolled at the university, they apparently continue to rely upon themselves to deal with the university's very different academic environment.[4] Not only are course standards usually higher with assignments reflecting a premium on writing and critical thinking, but also university student behaviors are different from those in the community college. Remember that transfer students in this study were surprised at the competitiveness among the university students. The university in the study is not atypical. Williams (1973), in his discussion of transfer shock, indicated that the community college failed to prepare students for "university-level competition" (p.321).

Another major difference between the two institutions seems to be faculty attitudes and behavior toward students. Faculty at community colleges generally emphasize development of students' academic abilities rather than expecting them to demonstrate these abilities initially and failing them if they do not (McGrath and Spear 1991). In contrast, the attitude of four-year college and university faculty and administrators toward students often seems to reflect a Darwinian perspective about academic success: The academically fit will demonstrate their ability and survive, while the less fit will withdraw or flunk out (Boice 1992). From the faculty member's perspective, it is the student's responsibility to correct any deficiencies in academic preparation, not the faculty member's. While all of the students in this study had positive comments to make about university faculty, some of the students described university faculty behavior that suggests a "survival of the fittest" attitude toward students. Even at an institution officially committed to teaching and a student-centered approach, some university faculty seemed reluctant to help directly students who entered a course without what faculty perceived to be the appropriate academic background.

Thus this study suggests that community college transfers, normed at the community college to a student-centered approach designed to raise self-esteem sometimes at the expense of academic standards (Seidman 1985), may be confused and shocked when they face different standards and expectations at the university. Those

who are able to rely upon themselves, not the faculty or fellow students, can survive. Those who expect help from the faculty and students who are not relatives or friends prior to entry to the university may well be unable to survive in the university environment.

Practical implications of the differing academic environments found in this study include the following and are not limited to the two institutions of the study. At the very least, community college faculty who wish to see students well prepared for transfer would be well advised to increase writing assignments and the use of essay tests. The faculty may also wish to convey to students who are clearly going to transfer that university grading standards may be more rigorous than community college standards, owing to different institutional missions and faculty attitudes toward the teaching-learning process.

At the university level, faculty should be encouraged to reexamine their attitudes toward faculty's responsibility in the teaching process. Also administrators should reexamine the institution's commitment to helping students whose academic backgrounds may be lacking in certain areas. Are students expected to sink or swim? Is this a conscious, deliberately chosen institutional attitude or an unanticipated outcome of failure to reflect about institutional and faculty commitments to students? As faculty and administrators reflect about their responsibilities in teaching, they should consider Alexander Astin's (1985) model of "talent development," which emphasizes faculty and student collaboration in developing students' talents and abilities. His paradigm for the teaching-learning process is suggested in the wistful comments of at least some of the community college transfers in this study, when they comment on the differences between the community college and the university. If universities are sincere about increasing the enrollment and retention of community college transfer students, institutional endorsement of the "survival of the fittest" approach to student success needs to be rethought.[5]

1. By international students, I mean immigrants to the United States, not individuals who are in the country on a temporary study visa.

2. With its undergraduate students, the university differentiates between full-time (12 or more hours each semester) and part-time students, admitting them under a different selection process and assigning them to different administrative offices. Consequently, the demographic makeup of the two student bodies is quite different. Since the students in this study were admitted as full-time students, further information about the university's undergraduate students will be based on its full-time undergraduate students.

3. The community college's transfer center was established in 1989 but was not in full operation until 1991. of the students who were interviewed transferred before the center was established.

4. See Doughterty (1987) on "tougher standards of the four-year colleges" and "poorer academic preparation in the community college" (p. 99).

5. See also B. Townsend's "Can Community College Transfers Survive in Metropolitan Universities?" in Metropolitan Universities (in press).

TRUMAN TRANSFER STUDENTS
F 1987 - S 1992

TABLE 1

GROUP	N	GENDER	*AVE.AGE	RACE/ETHNICITY			AVE. HRS. TRANS.	*AVG. CUM. GPA
Total Population	44	F 21 (48%) M 23 (52%)	27	Asian Black Hispanic White Other	7 12 7 17 1	(16%) (27%) (16%) (39%) (2%)	48.7	2.26
Current Students	21	F 9 (43%) M 12 (57%)	27	Asian Black Hispanic White Other	2 5 5 8 1	(10%) (24%) (24%) (38%) (5%)	44	2.68
Dropped Students	16	F 9 (56%) M 7 (44%)	28	Asian Black Hispanic White Other	2 6 1 7 0	(13%) (38%) (6%) (44%) (0%)	49.8	1.51
Graduates	7	F 3 (43%) M 4 (57%)	29	Asian Black Hispanic White Other	3 1 1 2 0	(43%) (14%) (14%) (29%) (0%)	57.6	2.70
Interviewed Students	9	F 6 (67%) M 3 (33%)	26	Asian Black Hispanic White Other	2 1 3 3 0	(22%) (11%) (33%) (33%) (0%)	39.1	2.76

* Indicates average as of Fall 1992

References

Astin, A. (1985). Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Donovan, R. A., Schaier-Peleg, B. S., & Forer, Bruce. (1987). Transfer: Making It Work. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Doughterty, K. (1987). The effects of community colleges: Aid or Hindrance to socioeconomic attainment? Sociology of Education, 60 (April): 86-103.

Hill, J. (1965). Transfer shock: The academic performance of the junior college transfer. Journal of Experimental Education, 33 201-216.

Kempner, K. (1990). Faculty culture in the community college: Facilitating or hindering learning. Research in Higher Education, 13 (2): 215-235.

Kintzer, F. C., & Wattenbarger, J. L. The Articulation/Transfer Phenomenon: Patterns and Directions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985.

Kissler, G. R., Lara, J.A., & Cardinal, J. L. (April 1981). Factors contributing to the academic difficulties encountered by students who transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

London, H. (1978). The Culture of a Community College. New York: Praeger Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1991). Designing Qualitative Research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

McGrath, D., & Spear, M. (1991). The Academic Crisis of the Community College. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Neumann, W., & Riesman, D. (1980). The community college elite. In Questioning the Community College Role. New Directions for Community Colleges, vol. 32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nolan, E. J., & Hall, D. L. (1978). Academic performance of the community college transfer student: A five-year follow-up study. Journal of College Student Personnel. November.

Pincus, F. & Archer, E. (1989). Bridges to Opportunity: Are Community Colleges Meeting the Transfer Needs of Minority Students? New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Richardson, R., Fisk, E., & Okun, M. (1983). Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Setting the National Agenda: Academic Achievement and Transfer. (1991). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 45, 89-125.

_____. (1987). Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Townsend, B. (1993). Can community college transfer students survive in metropolitan universities? Metropolitan Universities

(in press).
Weis, L. (1985). Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Williams, R. (1973). Transfer shock as seen from a student's point of view. College and University, 48, 320-321.

Appendix

Interview Questions

1. **[Community College] Assistance for Transferring**

   Did you receive any assistance at [the community college] when you decided to transfer to [the university]? Did you ask for any?

2. **[University] Assistance for Transferring**

   How about [the university], did you receive any assistance when you decided to transfer in? Did you ask for any?

   How would you evaluate this assistance?

   Is there anything [the university] should do to better aid students who want to transfer?

3. **[University] Transfer Student Orientation**

   Did you attend transfer student orientation at [the university]? If so, was it helpful?

   Is there anything that was not covered in the orientation session that should have been covered?

4. **Student Expectations of [the university]**

   a. **General**: Is [the university] what you expected it would be? If not, how is it different?

   b. **Academics**: Is [the university] different from [the community college] as far as academics are concerned? If so, how is it different?

   c. **Assignments**: Do you have more written assignments at [the university] that you did at [the community college], e.g., book reports, research papers?

   d. **Tests**: Are the testing procedures used by teachers at [the university] different from the procedures used by [the community college] teachers? If so, how are they different?

   e. **Teachers**: What is your general impression of the teachers at

[the university]? How would you compare them to [the community college] teachers?

f. **Students:** What is your general impression of the students at [the university]? How would you compare them to [the community college] students?

g. **Attendance Requirements:** How about [the university's] attendance requirements? Are they different from [the community college's]?

h. **Classroom Setting and Atmosphere:** Is the classroom setting and atmosphere different at [the university] as compared to [the community college]? If so, how?

i. **Preparation for [the university]:** Do you feel [the community college] academically prepared you to do well at [the university]? If not, what might it have done differently?